



Aalborg Universitet

**AALBORG UNIVERSITY**  
DENMARK

## **The Diversity of Government-Nonprofit Relations - Selected Cases from Danish Social Policy**

Henriksen, Lars Skov

*Publication date:*  
2007

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Henriksen, L. S. (2007). *The Diversity of Government-Nonprofit Relations - Selected Cases from Danish Social Policy*. Paper presented at International Research Society for Public Management, Potsdam, Germany.  
[http://www.irspm2007.org/Program/Open\\_Track/The\\_Non-Profit\\_Sector\\_and\\_Public\\_Services\\_-\\_Subpanel.html](http://www.irspm2007.org/Program/Open_Track/The_Non-Profit_Sector_and_Public_Services_-_Subpanel.html)

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# **The Diversity of Government-Nonprofit Relations – Selected Cases from Danish Social Policy**

*By Lars Skov Henriksen*

*Dept. of Sociology, Social Work and Organization, Aalborg University, Denmark*

Paper to be presented at the IRSPM panel on ‘Comparative Perspectives on the Government-Nonprofit Relationship’, Potsdam, Germany, April 2 – 4, 2007.

## **Introduction**

The study of how government-nonprofit relations have evolved over time in the Scandinavian countries has been informed by three very broad and general frameworks.

Earlier writings were dominated by a perspective in which an originally independent voluntary sector over time became subordinate to the public welfare system. This happened as a result of intensified contact between state and voluntary organizations where government increasingly used voluntary organisations and nonprofit institutions as instruments for the implementation of welfare policies. Characteristic of this approach is the idea that voluntary action originally was founded upon values that were fundamentally different from those characterizing government. Increasing contact therefore forms a latent threat against voluntary values and organizational models which becomes ‘colonized’ if government does not respect its special character. In Scandinavian the works of Håkon Lorentzen could be seen as an example of such an approach (Lorentzen, 1993; 1996).

To a large extent this approach looks upon the relationship between state and voluntary organizations as one of hierarchical subordination. The second approach, however, pictures the relationship as one of mutual collaboration. Rather than subordination we have a situation of equal co-operation. Kurt Klaudi Klausen (1989; 1995) is a representative of this approach which argues that organizational values and models are also transferred from the voluntary sector to government. When voluntary organizations interact with government they are often able to induce government to take over some of their work, methods and organizational values. Klausen argues that early modern Danish society was characterized by separate state, market and civil society sectors. Over time,

however, these separate spheres have become mixed and the boundaries between them blurred. Consequently, the voluntary sector has gradually lost its original values and characteristics, but this does not mean that it has become subordinate to government. Rather, Klausen suggests, government may be just as influenced by the voluntary sector as the other way round.

The third approach, primarily associated with the works of Stein Kuhnle and Per Selle (1990; 1992a; 1992b), points to the idea that the voluntary sector already from the beginning was mixed with state organizations and networks. Therefore it is impossible to operate with a voluntary sector that was from the beginning independent and separate from government. It is not a new situation that government-nonprofit relations are characterized by extensive collaboration and mutual integration rather than conflict and subordination. Therefore, it is wrong to compare voluntary organizations' present situation with one originally characterized by complete autonomy. Voluntary organizations were right from the beginning in the 19<sup>th</sup> century part of government policies. They probably have become more integrated over time, but this change is more quantitative than qualitative. Kuhnle and Selle find it hard, in general, to draw a picture of visionary and innovative voluntary organizations as opposed to a reactionary government bureaucracy. Rather, the voluntary sector reflects the overall social structures in society.

Such broad frameworks can be very useful because they provide us with general perspectives on important transformations. But it is equally obvious that their observations to a large extent are determined by the perspective chosen - one may say that Kuhnle & Selle and Klausen are closer to a consensus or harmony perspective, whereas Lorentzen is much closer to a conflict perspective (see also Repstad 1998:97,98).

It is also obvious that such general frameworks - which should apply to the voluntary sector as such - have difficulty in capturing the complexity and irregularities that characterize government-nonprofit relations. Considerable variation can be found in the ways in which government-nonprofit relations are played out over time – even within the same welfare regime and within the same field.

## **Capturing variations – the case study approach**

Based on a series of selected case studies from Denmark that explores the transformation of government-nonprofit relations from an organizational point of view this paper aims at capturing some of the variation in the government-nonprofit relationship that can be documented in closer empirical studies.

The case study approach taken here may supplement and qualify some of the implications of the broader frameworks. Such an approach, of course, cannot generate new general theory. Rather, the strength of the case study is the potential for revealing conceptual perspectives which may be found in social phenomena (Dahler-Larsen 1993:282). (see also Abbott)

The quality of a case study, however, rests to a large degree with the criteria for the selection of cases. How can we be sure that the selected cases have something important to tell about government-nonprofit relations over time? In this study cases have been selected according to three criteria.

First, all organizations are representatives of the field of social policy within a limited period of time (about 1900 - 1995). This field was chosen because we traditionally find close collaboration here (Lundström 1995; Lorentzen 1996; Selle & Øymyr 1995; Habermann & Ibsen 1997). Therefore we will argue that this field holds a potential for studying variations in government-nonprofit relations.

Second, the organizations represent three important types of organizations that have been important in Danish social policy: mutual benefit societies (e.g. for the risk of sickness); philanthropic organizations working on a religious base; and specialized interest organizations for particular member groups (e.g. the mentally disabled or the elderly).

Third, organizations were selected according to their co-operation with government. We have aimed at selecting organizations that have played different roles in social policy, and who appear to have had different relationships with government. That is, we have aimed at a ‘most unlike’ case selection (see also Yin; de Vaus).

The 13 organizations included in the study were:

*A) Mutual benefit societies:*

1) The Danish Health Insurance Societies (De danske sygekasser). The first societies were founded in 1841.

*B) Philanthropic organizations:*

2) The Copenhagen Benevolent Society (Kjøbenhavns Understøttelsesforening). Founded 1874.

3) The Church Army (Kirkens Korshær). Founded 1912.

4) The Blue Cross (Blå Kors). Founded 1895.

5) The Christian Association for Social Assistance to Children and Youngsters (Kristelig Forening til Bistand for Børn og Unge). Founded 1898.

6) The National Council for the Unmarried Mother and her Child (Mødrehjælpen). Founded 1924.

7) The Settlement Movement of Christian Students (Kristeligt Studenter Settelement). Founded 1911.

*C) Membership based interest organizations:*

8) National Association for Improved Hearing (Landsforeningen for Bedre Hørelse). Founded 1912.

9) The Danish National League for the Deaf (Danske Døves Landsforbund). Founded 1866.

10) The Elderly People's Movement (Ældre Sagen). Founded as The Solitary Elderly League (Ensomme Gamles Værn) in 1910.

11) The National League MIND (Landsforeningen SIND). Founded 1960.

12) The Mad-Movement (Galebevægelsen). Founded 1979.

13) The Danish ADHD Association (DAMP-foreningen) Founded 1982.

For detailed presentation and discussion of each case see Bundesen, Henriksen & Jørgensen (2001).

## **A typology of government-nonprofit relations**

The case study approach also raises the problem of how to handle individual organizational changes in a systematic way. In an effort to reduce complexity we use a typology originally developed by Per Selle and Stein Kuhnle (1990; 1992a; 1992b). The typology is an attempt to catch the systematic variation in the relations between voluntary organizations and government on the basis of two interdependent dimensions. The first dimension focuses on the degree of nearness-distance of the organizations in relation to government in terms of communication and contact.

Organizations may be more or less near, and hence more or less integrated with the state. Or they may be more or less distant and hence more or less separated from the state. The second dimension focuses on the degree of dependence-independence of organizations in relation to government.

Organizations may be more or less autonomous or more or less dependent in terms of public financing and control.

Combining these dimensions the following typology appears:

	<b>Nearness</b>	<b>Distance</b>
<b>Dependence</b>	1 Integrated dependence	2 Separate dependence
<b>Autonomy</b>	3 Integrated autonomy	4 Separate autonomy

Source: Kuhnle and Selle (1990:170; 1992a:30; 1992b:78)

We use this typology as a tool for our analysis of the individual case stories. However, the concepts underlying the typology may need some clarification. What is meant by ‘communication’, ‘contact’, ‘control’ etc.?

Kuhnle and Selle (1992a, p. 28) suggest that the closeness of organizations to government relates to the *scope, frequency and easiness* of communication and contact. We agree that these are central measures. Are we dealing with intense and regular contacts, or are we dealing with sporadic and superficial contacts? Another question is how easy it is for different types of organizations to get in contact with government. We also need to ask whether organizations and government want contact at all - and for what purposes.

To this we would add the *form* of communication and contact. Is it one that seeks influence by negotiating directly with government, for instance by seeking seats in public councils and commissions? Or is it one that more indirectly seeks influence through the public sphere, like for instance the media or demonstrations? Contact, however, need not be aimed at seeking influence or

defending interests. Contact also takes the form of joint projects or activities which may be more or less formal - ranging from what we might term “partnerships” to informal working relationships.

The second dimension relates to the independence of organizations from the state. According to Kunhle and Selle (1992a:29) organizations may either be autonomous or dependent in terms of *financing and control*. They underline that the aspect of control is more important than the aspect of financing, because public financing not necessarily entails strong governmental control. Many voluntary organizations in the western countries are dependent upon public financing, but this does not mean that they all suffer from heavy regulation. We agree upon this. However, this makes it even more important to discuss the different forms of control. Just as it makes it important to discuss how different forms of financing entail different degrees of autonomy.

In relation to *control* we would suggest that two aspects are central. First, to what degree are voluntary organizations *subject to legal and administrative control*, for instance rules of accounting and evaluation procedures. Second, to what degree are voluntary organizations *subject to public control as regards the quality of their services*. This is a kind of public regulation providing rules and norms for such things as the number of professional trained staff in relation to volunteers, the demand for particular qualifications among the staff and so on.

In relation to *financing* we would also suggest that two aspects are central. First, what is the *degree of public financing* relative to other sources such as private donations, membership fees, and income based on internal activities. More important, however, may be the second aspect of public financing, namely the form or *type of support*. One may distinguish between four types (Ibsen 1997:56). *General block grants*, i.e. public money provided for voluntary organizations without any particular requests or expectations (high degree of autonomy - low degree of control). *Contractual support*, i.e. money provided for voluntary organizations to run particular institutions and services on contract with government (low degree of autonomy - high degree of control). *Project support*, i.e. money provided for voluntary organizations to set up and run particular projects alone or in co-operation with other partners in a shorter period of time (medium degree of autonomy and control). Finally we would mention *indirect public support* such as free use of public premises, free telephone, and tax exemption for private donations (low degree of control).

## **The case studies**

In the following we present four ideal types of government-nonprofit relations that capture some of the variation within Danish social policy.

### **Type 1 – the disappearance of the distinction between voluntary organization and public administration**

The first ideal type includes organizations that initiated social services (both in cash and in kind) that early came to be defined as a public responsibility. In these cases increasing nearness were followed by a radical change in government-nonprofit relations. In our material this was the case of the Danish Health Insurance Societies, The Copenhagen Benevolent Society, and the National Council for the Unmarried Mother and her Child.

The history of *The National Council for the Unmarried Mother and her Child* (NCUMC, 'Mødrehjælpen') is an illustrative case of 'integrated dependence'. NCUMC was founded in 1924 uniting two associations that were concerned with the protection of mothers, expectant mothers and their children. These associations were originally established around 1900 as a result of increasing problems with clandestine child birth and unmarried women with children. In the first years NCUMC existed a privately financed organization with an independent management. However, in the 1930s discussions about legalisation of induced abortion came up and two commissions were appointed by government with the purpose of providing a basis for decision-making in parliament concerning the issues of abortion and population policy. In 1939 a decision was made to establish a nationwide public financed and state regulated organization that should replace the private NCUMC.

As a consequence of the "Act for institutions for the protection of mothers and expectant mothers" passed in 1939 ('Lov om mødrehjælpsinstitutioner') 7 institutions were established in the larger cities to work the way the NCUMC had done in Copenhagen. The following years another 7 institutions were established, and in 1970 their numbers had grown to 70. These institutions were



directly prescribed by the act as were also the aims of the institutions: They should organize and provide personal, social and judicial aid and information to expectant mothers. Accordingly NCUMC established different kinds of advisory centres as well as institutions and homes for children, mothers, expectant mothers, mothers with infants and so on. Numbers, location etc., however, were decided by the Ministry of social affairs, and the institutions were led by a board whose members represented the county council, the city council and the local hospital. Furthermore, the act prescribed the employees to have a formal education which qualified to work in the institutions. Consequently, employees at NCUMC were mainly recruited from the public educational system including social workers from the newly established School of social work in Copenhagen, lawyers, doctors and masters in political science. From 1939 until 1961 expenditures were defrayed jointly by the state and local governments. After 1961 the institutions became fully financed by the state.

The act, however, made it possible to establish local voluntary associations for the support of the institutions whose members could also serve on the board. The aim of the local associations was to provide the institutions with financial (as well as other kinds of) support which would enable them to take on tasks that were not directly prescribed by the act. Government wanted by this to establish an organization that was able to hold on to the private initiative.

With the passing of the “Act for institutions for the protection of mothers and expectant mothers” in 1939 NCUMC in fact ceased to exist as a voluntary organization. The objectives as well as the organization and financing of the institutions were prescribed by the act. Rather than a voluntary organization, NCUMC became one of the most important institutions in the construction of post war Danish welfare state. This is for instance to be seen in the fact that the organization over the years was made responsible for the administration of the adoption laws and the laws about pregnancy. The local associations were the only element of voluntarism left. This element, however, was important because it raised money for new projects and activities in which government from the beginning took no interest. Many of these initiatives were pioneering work which government over time took responsibility for. This made it possible for NCUMC not only to implement, but also to influence public policy.

In 1976 NCUMC was abolished. The legalization of induced abortion in 1973 and ‘The Social Assistance Act’ of 1976 undermined the organization’s work. As part of an administrative reform new and larger local governments became responsible for the new social laws. Because NCUMC at that time was a fully integrated part of state administration it got into a tight corner. Moreover, as induced abortion was legalized every woman was now free to choose abortion. One of the main tasks therefore disappeared.

The history of the NCUMC is one of radical transformation. It originated as an independent and pioneering organization, but because of the growing awareness of public responsibility in relation to single mothers and child care it became an integrated part of the welfare state project already in 1939. It seems that the NCUMC in the 1930s made a perfect fit with state policies. This position was held until another radical change took place in the 1970s with the passing of a new social assistance act. With the implementation of this act the NCUMC suddenly became more or less incompatible with governmental efforts to rationalize the administration of social policy.

What is important in this type of case is the fact that the organization quite early came to act on behalf of government. NCUMC was in fact turned into a governmental body that administered legal acts, deciding, among other things, who was given the permission to induced abortion. This made it increasingly difficult to distinguish between voluntary organization and public administration. The state had full control and financed close to all services. No arm-length principle existed. This ‘colonization’, however did not run counter to the ideology of the ‘organizational owners’. The idea of a rights based public system with broad coverage was in accordance with the ambition of NCUMC. One therefore finds very little conflict between state and organization from the 1930s up till 1970. Strong opposition and resistance, however, emerged from within the organization with the ideas of a social assistance act that argued in favour of transferring tasks and services to local government.

## **Type 2 – the development of a nonprofit service provider**

The development of an encompassing public welfare system in Denmark has not been tantamount to little or no room for voluntary or nonprofit service provision – though public provision of

services is a central feature of the Scandinavian welfare model (Kuhnle 1992). In some areas, such as child care, homes and institutions for handicapped, and treatment of alcohol abusers, in which notably Christian welfare organizations in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century developed services and institutions, government continued to be dependent upon voluntary organizations and nonprofit institutions as providers of publicly financed service.

This integration of voluntary service provision is also a case of ‘integrated dependence’, but one characterised by a looser coupling between voluntary organization and public administration, and, hence, more organizational autonomy.

In our material organizations such as the Blue Cross, the Christian Association for Social Assistance to Children and Youngsters, and also the Solitary Elderly League are examples of this type. Also the Church Army in some respect comes close to this type.

*The Christian Association for Social Assistance to Children and Youngsters (CASA)* was founded in 1898 by a priest who was working as a prison chaplain. The original name of the organization was “The Christian Association for Saving Children Prosecuted and Punished by the Public”. The main purpose was to prevent children from being punished. The alternative was to place them in Christian countryside foster-homes.

Through collected funds the association started its work. Because there was no public authority to organize the placing of children, CASA had to co-operate with parents and families. But CASA also had to co-operate closely with public authorities to convince them of the advantages of placing children in foster-families instead of imprisonment. From the beginning the efforts of the association gained public attention. For instance public authorities made contributions to CASA’s collections.

One of CASA’s main goals was to make possible the placement of children outside their families by force. CASA also made an effort to make the public system economically responsible for the placing of the children. Both requests were fulfilled with the 1905 passing of ‘The Children’s Act’. It was now possible to place children outside their homes either forced by law and with public support, or voluntarily with economic support from the association itself.

From the beginning the organization wanted the placing of children in foster-families to have first priority. To ensure the placement to be for the benefit of the child the organization established special reformatories to clarify the placing of the children. This was a piece of pioneering work in Danish child care. In 1923 there were seven such reformatories. However, it turned out to be more difficult than expected to place all children in foster-homes. According to CASA many children were not able to live in foster-families. In 1921 only 27 of the 232 children being under the protection of the association were actually in foster-homes. The rest were kept in the reformatories which over the years had turned into regular children's homes. From the mid-1920s the association took the consequences of this situation and established different kinds and over the years more specialised homes and institutions for children that needed care and treatment.

Especially after World War II, when government financial support increased, CASA came to own and run quite a large number of children's homes and institutions. The post war period also brought considerable change in the professional understanding of child care. A new system of diagnosis was introduced, which CASA gradually adopted.

In 1976 when the "Social Assistance Act" was implemented regional county councils became new contract partners (instead of the state). At the same time it became more difficult for private organizations to own and run institutions because the act prescribed these to be 'self-governing'. Furthermore, public control was strengthened through a set of common guidelines which all institutions (whether public or private) had to follow.

CASA, however, specialized as an administrator of the so-called self-governing institutions. At present the number of institutions either run or administered by CASA counts seventeen children's homes, three day care centres, two schools for the education of pedagogues and a continuation school.

The history of CASA is one of early integration. The organization was actively influencing the childrens' act of 1905, but this pioneering role was followed by a much more passive and adaptive strategy. Instead, the organization took on a role as service provider. This role extended in the 1950s with the growth of state financed child care (see Skocpol for a parallel).

This type of government-nonprofit relation is wide spread and well known from many countries. What is interesting here is the prevalence of nonprofit service supply in certain niches where organizations have developed particular skills and competences that government depends on. This is also the case in so-called social-democratic welfare states; though more in Denmark than in Norway and Sweden (Henriksen, Boje, Ibsen, Koch-Nielsen *et al.*). A large public sector does not rule out nonprofit services. However, what is characteristic is the normative and coercive isomorphism that occurs as a consequence of state regulation and the development of professional standards.

### **Type 3 – the mutual growth of public responsibility and private advocacy**

Complementary to the mutual benefit societies and the philanthropic organizations, the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century also witnessed a rise in organizations catering for the welfare needs of particular groups (such as the blind, the deaf, the physically handicapped, the mentally ill, the elderly *et al.*). Besides promoting the interest of these groups, the organizations often provided services and information. Many of these organizations were welfare pioneers who - especially after World War II when public responsibility was expanded – cultivated the advocacy role. Many of them were formed exactly to put pressure on the welfare state to assume responsibility and allocate resources to specialised problem groups. Growing public responsibility, therefore, was followed by an increase in interest representation.

Examples of organizations in our material that have assumed an interest or advocacy role are the National Association for Improved Hearing, The Danish National League for the Deaf, The Elderly People's Movement, The National League MIND, and The Danish ADHD Association.

A late but very clear example is the Elderly People's Movement ('Ældre Sagen') which was originally founded in 1910 as The Solitary Elderly League (SEL) ('Einsomme Gamles Værn'). Originally it was founded on philanthropic (however not pronounced religious) values with the aim of establishing homes for the elderly and carrying out welfare work in Copenhagen. The income of the organization was derived primarily through private collections, bazaars, lotteries, and donations. Besides that users were charged in small scale. No control or inspection with the organization's services or activities was made by public authorities in the formative years.

Actually this was the situation for the first fifty years where the organization was run independently of government and with only scarce contact with public authorities. Neither do we find any indication that SEL tried to influence public policy towards the elderly. Hence, we could characterise the early years as ‘separate autonomy’.

This position, however, changed in 1964 as a consequence of the passing of the so-called ‘Act of elderly care’ (‘Omsorgsloven’). This act made local government responsible for care for the elderly. SEL had developed some experience in care and services for the elderly, and over the next twenty years the league developed into one of the most important providers of homes and institutions. During these years SEL became an important pioneer in welfare work for the elderly in Denmark. Becoming an integrated partner in municipal welfare provision, however, also resulted in close economic and administrative dependence upon local government.

This situation of integrated dependence resulted in rising organizational uncertainty as to who SEL was representing. It was felt that the organization had become too much of a tool in the hands of local government. As a consequence the council (‘repræsentantskab’) of SEL in 1986 decided to abolish the organization. On the grounds of the old organization two new organizations were formed. One was called the ‘SEL Foundation’ which continued as a service provider. The other was called ‘The Elderly Peoples’ Movement’ (EPM), the ambition of which was to create a strong national membership based interest organization for the elderly.<sup>3</sup>

The purpose of EPM was mainly to promote and pursue the interests of the elderly in relation to (local and national) public policy, but also to initiate and support welfare work, for instance by organizing visiting friends for lonely elderly people. The EPM was a major success. In 1997 the membership counted no less than 335,000 persons. About 1/3 of the population beyond the age of 67 have joined the organization. Not least by applying modern public relations methods EPM has succeeded in recruiting many members. Today most of the income of the EPM is derived from

---

3

We may conceptualize this organizational split as a loose coupling (Orton and Weick, 1990:205) between a nonprofit organization for service provision, and a membership based association to communicate and maximize members’ interests.

membership fees and the organization's own lottery. Financially, the organization is therefore almost totally independent of governmental support. At the same time it has succeeded in influencing public opinion, not least by undertaking serious research about living conditions of the elderly that has been effectively put on the public agenda.

What is interesting about this case type is the parallel growth of public responsibility and membership based interest representation. EPM is one of the best examples in Danish social policy of a modern, professionalized interest organization which skilfully influences public policy as regards problem definition and resource allocation in order to enhance government responsibilities and change public attitudes.

We will argue that a successful attention to the membership's interests is a case of integrated autonomy.

#### **Type 4 - The critical voice**

A totally different organization - partly formed in opposition to a more traditional interest organization ('the National League MIND') - is 'the Mad-Movement' ('Galebevægelsen'). This organization was founded in 1979 as a conglomerate of groups that were critical of the established psychiatric system. Through seminars, actions, happenings, and a membership journal, different local groups were brought together in a nationwide movement. The movement was primarily founded by professionals from psychiatric hospitals or related areas. Included in the movement were both patients and ex patients, relatives, professionals who were in opposition to the psychiatric system, and others with a critical interest in the psychiatric treatment system. The ideas were rooted in the American anti-psychiatry movement who disagreed with dominant understandings of mental illness. The Mad-Movement was convinced that in many cases mental illness was a healthy reaction to an unhealthy society. From the beginning the movement was financed by membership fees and sales of the membership journal and other books. Later the movement succeeded in getting minor public support, mostly in the form of project support (for instance radio transmissions produced by mentally ill for mentally ill).

Right from the beginning methods and goals that dominated care and treatment for mentally ill were rejected. The main purpose was to protest and raise public debate. The organization closely watched the 'psychiatric establishment', but it never attempted to bring about a dialogue. The movement's communication strategy was primarily characterized by media-oriented actions and happenings.

During the first ten years of the movement's history it was successful in this strategy. However, internal as well as external changes brought the organization into a crisis. First, pervasive changes took place from within the psychiatric treatment system itself from the mid-80s. So-called 'community psychiatry' was gradually implemented at the same time as large hospitals ('total institutions') were closed down. New methods of treatment were introduced, some of which were based on the idea that mental illness and societal development should be considered interrelated factors. This conception of mental illness was close to the original ideas of the Mad-Movement. Its critical and oppositional role, therefore, was undermined. Second, the movement experienced an internal showdown which eventually led to the exclusion of all members who held professional positions within the psychiatric system. From this time ex patients were given priority, for instance they were given the right of veto in all important matters. Because the Mad-Movement was primarily founded by professionals these internal conflicts weakened the movement, and in the 1990's it gradually lost public attention.

Contrary to other interest organizations who took the co-operative road the Mad-Movement never sought that kind of contact. Nor did it become dependent upon public support. It was more of a social movement trying to influence the established system via the public media and critical discussions with professionals. It never became a partner of the established psychiatric system, but it would be wrong to say that it did not influence this system. To all appearances the Mad-Movement played a critical role in the transformation of Danish psychiatry.

This example of 'separate autonomy' might be taken as an exceptional case and in many ways it is. This kind of organization is not the typical voluntary organization. On the other hand, from time to time strong expressive organizations and movements do appear who identifies unaddressed problems and brings them to public attention. What is crucial in this type of case is the dependence on public awareness. When political communication dries out in the public sphere, social movements run out of fuel.



## Discussion

Government-nonprofit relations vary in scope, intensity, and type. In this paper we have tried to capture some of the variation by applying a systematic typology to selected cases.

For many of the organizations in our sample there seems to be a general increase in communication and contact with public administration over time. Many organizations move in the direction of nearness and dependence. Historically, this expresses the fact that welfare state intervention has come to include more and more areas of social life - hence also those dominated by voluntary organizations in the earlier phases of modern Danish society (Henriksen and Bundesen 2001; Smith 2007).

One could argue that this would be in accordance with Lorentzen's broad framework suggesting a general transformation in which originally independent voluntary organizations have become subordinate to the public welfare system. However, as a general picture we do not support this thesis of colonization and integration - although some organizations obviously have gone that way.

First, it is important to make a distinction between those organizations that literally have become absorbed by the state apparatus (a case we have illustrated with the NCUMC), and those organizations that have developed a service provision role (as illustrated by the case of CASA). Being responsible for administering particular social policy laws entails very strong public control. Providing services can also entail public scrutiny and control, but government can – in principle – be kept at arms length. The degree of autonomy, however, varies. In some areas, such as child care, voluntary organizations have had to adapt to central norms and standards, whereas other areas, such as treatment for alcoholics, have been less regulated. What is also important is the type of financial support. Providing services on contract with government often implies accountability and evaluation procedures. More autonomy can be obtained in development projects or initiatives financed by resources generated by the organization itself. This was important in the cases of NCUMC and CASA although they were both heavily dependent upon government support.

Second, we need to differentiate between those organizations that have developed partnerships and worked with government, and those organizations that have tried to influence governmental policies

and change public attitudes towards social problems. The latter is a case of interest representation which is one of the most crucial and important features of Danish post war social policy. In general, a multitude of formal membership based organizations have been formed to improve living conditions, reallocate governmental resources, and højne public attention. These organizations either seek to influence government policies by negotiation or they try to direct attention to their members' needs and interests (as illustrated in the case of EPM).

While many interest groups are highly formalised and professionalized organizations others are more loosely structured social movements that deliberately seek distance to and even conflict with government. However, these can also, as illustrated by the Mad-Movement, successfully influence and change social policy.

## References (incomplete)

- Bundesen, Peter, Lars Skov Henriksen & Anja Jørgensen (2001): *Filantropi, selvhjælp og interesseorganisering*. Odense University Press.
- Dahler-Larsen, Peter (1993): *Fællesskabet af dem, som intet fællesskab har*. Afhandlinger fra det samfundsvidenskabelige fakultet, Odense Universitet.
- Habermann, Ulla & Bjarne Ibsen (1997): Den frivillige sektor i Danmark - 150 års udvikling. I: *Frivilligt socialt arbejde i fremtidens velfærdssamfund. Bilagsdel*. Udvalget om frivilligt socialt arbejde, Socialministeriet.
- Ibsen, Bjarne (1996): Changes in local voluntary associations in Denmark. *Voluntas*, Vol.7, No.2.
- Klausen, Kurt Klaudi (1989): Den tredje sektor - Frivillige organisationer mellem stat og marked. I: Klausen, Kurt Klaudi & Torben Hviid Nielsen (red.): *Stat og marked*. Charlottenlund: Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag.
- Klausen, Kurt Klaudi (1995): Et historisk rids over den tredje sektors udvikling i Danmark. I: Klausen, Kurt Klaudi & Per Selle (red.): *Frivillig Organisering i Norden*. København: Jurist- og Økonomforbundets Forlag.
- Klausen, Kurt Klaudi & Per Selle (1996): The Third Sector in Scandinavia. *Voluntas*, Vol. 7, No. 2: 99-122.
- Kuhnle, Stein & Per Selle (1990): Autonomi eller underordning: Frivillige organisasjoner og det offentlige. I: Kuhnle, Stein & Per Selle (red.): *Frivillig organisert velferd - alternativ til offentlig?* Bergen: Alma Mater Forlag AS.
- Kuhnle, Stein & Per Selle (1992a): Government and Voluntary Organizations: A relational perspective. In: Kuhnle, Stein & Per Selle (Eds.): *Government and Voluntary Organizations*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Kuhnle, Stein & Per Selle (1992b): The Historical Precedent for Government-Nonprofit cooperation in Norway. In: Gidron, Benjamin, Ralph Kramer & Lester Salamon (Eds.): *Government and the Third Sector - Emerging Relationships in the Welfare States*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Lorentzen, Håkon (1993): *Frivillighetens integrasjon*. Rapport 93:10, Institutt for samfunnsforskning, Oslo.
- Lorentzen, Håkon (1996): Stat og organisasjoner fra et historisk perspektiv. I: Rasmussen, Elisabeth T. & Inger Koch-Nielsen (red.): *Den tredje sektor under forandring*. Kpbenhavn: Social-forskningsinstituttet.
- Luhmann, Niklas (1990): *Political Theory in the Welfare State*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Lundström, Tommy (1995): Frivilligt socialt arbete under omprövning. *Socialvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, Vol. 2, Nr. 1: 39-59.

Orton, J. Douglas & Karl E. Weick (1990): Loosely Coupled Systems: A Reconceptualization. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 15, No. 2: 203-223.

Repstad, Pål (1998): Forholdet mellom det offentlige og det frivillige - et for nærsynt forskningstema i Norge? *Tidsskrift for velferdsforskning*, Vol. 1, Nr. 2: 97-101.

Salamon, Lester M. (1987): Of Market Failure and Third-party Government: Toward a Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations in the Modern Welfare State. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, Vol.16, Nos.1-2.

Selle, Per & Bjarne Øymyr (1995): *Frivillig organisering og demokrati. Det frivillige organisasjonssamfunnet endrar seg 1940-1990*. Oslo: Samlaget.